

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
CLARENCE AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANE COUNTY MENTAL  
HEALTH,

Defendant.

ORDER

07-cv-192-bbc

-----  
CLARENCE ANTONIO AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANE COUNTY JAIL and  
WISCONSIN PENAL SYSTEM,

Defendants.

ORDER

08-cv-180-bbc

-----  
CLARENCE A. AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

08-cv-280-bbc

DANE COUNTY JAIL, DODGE CORRECTION  
FACILITY, OAK HILL CORRECTION  
FACILITY, RESOURCE CENTER  
and MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

-----  
CLARENCE AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANE COUNTY JAIL,

Defendant.

ORDER

08-cv-652-bbc

-----  
CLARENCE ANTONIO AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPEEDWAY GAS STATION and  
WAL-MART,

Defendants.

ORDER

09-cv-244-bbc

-----  
Over the last three years, plaintiff has filed the five cases listed above. The first four involved plaintiff's treatment while he was incarcerated at the Dane County jail. I dismissed

each of these either because plaintiff did not raise allegations against the named defendant or because he sued facilities such as the Dane County jail, which are not “persons” that may be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In plaintiff’s fifth lawsuit, case no. 09-cv-244-bbc, he attempted to sue defendants Speedway Gas Station and Wal-Mart for discriminating against him because of his race. I dismissed his complaint because his vague allegations violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and gave him a chance to submit an amended complaint with additional detail. When plaintiff did not submit an amended complaint by the deadline for doing so, the case was closed.

Now plaintiff has filed a motion in each of the five cases seeking to reopen them. However, he provides no reasons why the motions should be granted. Instead, his motions consist of vague statements that at best repeat his desire to reopen the cases and at worst, vaguely threaten the court. In any case, there is simply no reason why these cases should be reopened. In each of plaintiff’s first four actions, he failed to include allegations against named defendants capable of being sued. As for plaintiff’s fifth case, there would be no point to reopening the case because plaintiff has failed to submit an amended complaint in accordance with my previous order in that case. Accordingly, plaintiff’s motions to reopen

each of these cases are DENIED.

Entered this 6th day of May, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge